

although technically, as a matter of semantics, the decision was made by the President of the United States, just as it is said that the State Department does not make policy, that the President is the ultimate maker of foreign policy, but we do know, of course, that the State Department does make a great deal of foreign policy, just as the Pentagon is making a great deal of foreign policy.

Mr. GORE. Sometimes the Senate itself makes foreign policy by amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Sometimes I wish it would make it more often.

In this connection, it might be pointed out that the bad advice which has been given our Presidents may have been responsible for much of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. It is clear that many of the decisions were made without adequate knowledge of the situation in southeast Asia, which suddenly took those who have been advising the President by surprise.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Senator Morse beginning on the next page.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am having inserted in the record my statement that I made at Allentown, Pa., on Saturday, because, interestingly enough, it will contain an answer to the point of view expressed by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in regard to our relationship with France, and also setting forth my views in regard to the NATO crisis.

I wonder how many Americans, if they were Frenchmen, would be voting to leave thousands and thousands of American troops on French soil, in view of the military record we are making elsewhere in the world.

Why are we so surprised that there is a growing concern and fear of American military power in France? We interpret SEATO, of which France is a member, entirely to suit ourselves and without regard to the news or interests of the other parties. How can France or other NATO members know whether we will use and interpret the North Atlantic Treaty the same way?

The trouble with us is we do not like to look at ourselves. The trouble with us is that we think our Narcissus image that we have painted for ourselves is accepted by millions of people elsewhere in the world. The trouble with Americans these days is that we do not recognize the fact that we are bitterly hated by millions of people in many places of the world, for they see all the difference between our verbal statements and our actions, and condemn us for a growing hypocrisy, of which we are guilty.

Mr. President, would that my conscience and my convictions did not dictate that I must warn the American people: "It is not too late for you to exercise the check that the Constitution gives you to stop this trend away from democracy in America and bring your Government back within the framework of constitutional power."

#### NEED FOR CIA COMMITTEE

All one need do to learn about the danger is to read the Record made earlier this afternoon on the floor of the Senate in regard to the CIA. It is hard to believe that it would be seriously proposed in the Senate that a small group of senior citizens should have a monopolistic right to have access to information dealing with the operation of a police state institution that has been allowed to grow up in the body politic of this Republic, for the CIA is a police institution that has no place in democracy except under careful surveillance of our check-and-balance system.

As I listened to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] seek to justify the type relationship that exists between the CIA and the select few in this body who can have access to some information of the CIA, I knew that my case was proved.

By what right—and I speak respectfully of him—does the Senator from Massachusetts think the American people are protected because he has his meetings in various forums—and I think the record will show in his home and others—with McCone or Allen Dulles or Raborn? What kind of check is that on the CIA?

Of course, I have voted hundreds of millions of dollars for a spy system; but I have not voted for a spy system free from the check of the elected representatives of the American people and of Congress. In my judgment, the security of the country, in my judgment, is such that it is

necessary to have, in that line, for the American military, including the CIA, in the formulation of American foreign policy.

So I join with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and other Senators when I say that the CIA should be checked, and that the Committee on Foreign Relations should have the representation of a watchdog committee to check it.

Let me also say that I do not accept the major premise that the elected officials of the American people should not have an opportunity to be briefed in executive sessions of their committees in regard to what their checking committee has found.

To get the ugly reality out on the floor of the Senate—for I think it is here, and I think some of the facts this afternoon skirted on the edges of it—those who are on the "in" with the CIA do not want the Committee on Foreign Relations or representatives of that committee to have any checking voice in connection with the affairs of the CIA. My conclusion is that they run a pretty good chance that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations would not agree with many of the things that the CIA is doing in the field of foreign policy.

I yield to no one in my high regard for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], but I completely disagree with his position on the CIA. For the Senator from Georgia, when he says that the CIA really did not determine foreign policy in connection with the Bay of Pigs, is grossly mistaken. The fact that John Fitzgerald Kennedy later assumed full responsibility for that fiasco does not change the fact that the CIA misled him. CIA both formulated and executed a foreign policy at the Bay of Pigs and it continues doing so today. I conducted the executive session hearings in regard to the investigation of the CIA, and I say to the Senate this afternoon that I am perfectly satisfied it never would have occurred except for the CIA. The President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, never would have been misled except for the CIA. In fact, I hold the CIA more responsible than the Joint Chiefs of Staff, although they also misled the President.

The sad thing is that President Kennedy came to recognize it and told a considerable number of us so, but he made a great mistake when they sold him a bill of goods that he should not consult Congress.

Imagine what would have happened if John Fitzgerald Kennedy had come back to the Foreign Relations Committee and apprised it of the recommendations being made for the Bay of Pigs. Why, Mr. President, of one thing you can be certain, and that is that the overwhelming majority of the Foreign Relations Committee would have advised against it, as the chairman of the committee did when he was apprised of it at the eleventh hour, under a strict doctrine of privilege.

Of course, it is to the great historic credit of President Kennedy that he assumed the responsibility. But I have been heard to say before, and say now, irrespective of his statement about responsibility, that the wrongdoers were the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Bay of Pigs is one example to which I wish to invite the attention of the American people as supporting part

American military, including the CIA, in the formulation of American foreign policy.

Of course, CIA is a foreign policy agency. Whether it is supervised by the President and the State Department is not the issue here. The issue for us is whether the congressional check upon CIA should extend only to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, but not to the Foreign Relations Committee, when its activities in fact have as much to do with foreign affairs as with military affairs.

I know that John Fitzgerald Kennedy, prior to his death, expressed the view that he was also concerned about whether he was being sucked into—and that was his language—sucked into another Bay of Pigs in Vietnam. That is why he sent his Ambassador to India, Mr. Galbraith, to Vietnam to make a study and to report to him.

There is no doubt about the advice that the Ambassador gave, and that the Ambassador in his findings supported the position that I was taking at that time, the same position President Kennedy was taking before his death. I had expressed to him, before his death, my great concern for the course of action he was following in Vietnam because, as I said to the President, "What concerns me is the military advisers being only a step away from ground troops." Although the President said it was not his intention, nevertheless, it was perfectly obvious that that is what would happen unless the President stopped the course of action he was following.

No one knows what he would have done had he lived, but I am satisfied that the Galbraith report shook him. I am also satisfied that, had the President lived, we would not be escalating the war in Vietnam today. That war would have been either settled on honorable terms, or we would be out.

Thus, as I close my speech, this will be the first time I have ever said this, because it is the first time that I have come to this conclusion: If the United Nations continues to refuse to live up to its treaty obligations of enforcing the peace in South Vietnam, as it did in the Congo, as it is doing in the Gaza Strip, as it is doing in Cyprus, and as it did in the war between India and Pakistan, if my President continues to refuse to call upon an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to call for a cease-fire order, and pledge that they will support a cease-fire order—and we will cooperate with it—then let me say that my Government cannot possibly justify the continuing slaughter of young Americans in Vietnam in support of a corrupt military junta in Vietnam, a junta which today is beginning a civil war within a civil war and which the American people are entitled to have stopped. If the President refuses to follow these other procedures, then I believe the time will have come for us to say that unless these procedures are followed, we should get out and let South Vietnam determine its own policies.